

Pam. misc. 1452

# AMERICANISM

---

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. BORAH

OF IDAHO

IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FRIDAY

FEBRUARY 21, 1919



WASHINGTON  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

1919

106587--19309

SPEECH  
OF  
HON. WILLIAM E. BORAH.

---

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the people of the United States have the undoubted right to change their form of government and to renounce established customs or long-standing policies whenever in their wisdom they see fit to do so. As a believer in democratic government, I readily acknowledge the right of the people to make in an orderly fashion such changes as may be approved by their judgment at any time. I contend, moreover, that when radical and important departures from established national policies are proposed, the people ought to be consulted.

We are now proposing what to my mind is the most radical departure from our policies hitherto obtaining that has ever been proposed at any time since our Government was established. I think the advocates of the league will agree with me that it is a pronounced departure from all the policies which we have heretofore obtained.

It may be wise, as they contend; nevertheless, it involves a different course of conduct upon the part of the Government and of our people for the future, and the people are entitled to pass judgment upon the advisability of such a course.

It seems clear, also, that this proposed program, if it is to be made effective and operative under the proposed constitution of the league, involves a change in our Constitution. Certainly, questions of that kind ought to be submitted to a plebiscite or to a vote of the people, and the Constitution amended in the manner provided for amending that instrument. We are merely agents of the people; and it will not be contended that we have received any authority from the principal, the people, to proceed along this line. It is a greater responsibility than an agent ought to assume without express authority or approval from his principal to say nothing of the want of authority. Preliminary to a discussion of this question, therefore, I want to declare my belief that we should arrange the machinery for taking a vote of the people of the United States upon this stupendous program. I am aware that the processes by which that may be accomplished involve some difficulties; but they are not insurmountable, and they are by no means to be compared in their difficulty with the importance of being right, and in harmony with the judgment of the people before we proceed to a final approval. We should have the specific indorsement of those whose agents we are and we should have the changes in our Constitution that we may have sanction under the Constitution for the fearful responsibility we propose to assume. If we can effectuate this change now proposed without direct authority from the people

I can not think of a question of sufficient moment to call for their indorsement.

It must be conceded that this program can never be a success unless there is behind it the intelligent and sustained public opinion of the United States. If the voters do not have their voice before the program is initiated, they will certainly have an opportunity to give expression to their views in the future. They are still the source of power, and through their votes they effectuate the policies under which we must live. From the standpoint, therefore, of expediency and from the standpoint of fairness to those who are most concerned, to wit, the people, those who must carry the burdens, if there be burdens, and suffer the consequences, if there should be ill consequences to suffer, as well as from the standpoint of insuring success, if possible, the mass of the people ought to be consulted and their approval had before we proceed. I, therefore, in the very beginning of this procedure, declare in favor of that program.

Mr. President, I think I should have deferred any remarks I had to make upon this subject until a later day, had it not been for an interview which was put out by Mr. Taft some two or three days ago upon this question. I felt, in view of that statement, that those who were opposed to the program were justified in proceeding at once to the debate, because it is a statement which in my judgment is not founded upon fact. In saying that I do not charge a conscious purpose upon the part of Mr. Taft to mislead, but I am sure it can not be sustained by the historic facts at the command of anyone who desires to examine the subject; and as it can not be sustained, it is to the utmost degree misleading.

Mr. Taft informs the American people, from the pedestal of an ex-President, that this program does not destroy the policy announced by Washington in his Farewell Address and does not renounce the doctrine known as the Monroe doctrine—two fundamental principles underlying our foreign policy for more than 100 years in one instance and nearly 100 years in the other; two policies to which the American people have long been committed, and which, in my judgment, they still believe to be indispensable to their happiness and future tranquillity. If, indeed, this program does dispose of these policies, it presents an entirely different question to the American people than if the reverse were true. This is one of the first things to be settled in this controversy. It meets us at the very threshold of all discussion and all consideration. It is of such moment as to call for clear statement and candid presentation. What is the effect of this proposed program upon these ancient and most vital policies?

Mr. Taft says:

Article 10 covers the Monroe doctrine and extends it to the world.  
 \* \* \* The league is to be regarded as in conflict with the advice of Washington only with a narrow and reactionary viewpoint.

"Reactionary" is not a familiar term in the ex-President's vocabulary. I think he has unintentionally misused it.

Mr. President, prior to the administration of Washington, America had been involved in every European war since colonization began. When a difficulty arose in Europe, whatever might be the subject of the difficulty, whether dynastic quarrels or territorial aggrandizement, it spread at once to the American



Continent. Although we might be wholly unconcerned in the controversy upon its merits, nevertheless the evil effects of the conflict in Europe enveloped the people of this country in its consequences. As you recall, Macaulay, in his graphic way in the essay upon Frederick the Great, said:

In order that he might rob a neighbor whom he had promised to defend, black men fought on the coast of Coromandel and red men scalped each other by the Great Lakes of North America.

When Washington assumed the responsibilities as administrator of this Government, he immediately set about to change that condition of affairs; to wit, to separate the European system from the American system, to withdraw our people from her broils, to individualize the American Nation, and to divorce us from the quarrels and turmoils of European life. This was peculiarly and distinctly a policy originating with the Father of our Country. If there is any one thing in his entire career, marvelous as it was, which can be said to be distinctly his, it is the foreign policy which characterized his administration. His idea almost alone in the first instance was that we never could become a nation with a national mind, a national purpose, and national ideals, until we divorced ourselves from the European system. He entertained this view before he became President. I venture to recall to your minds a letter which he wrote, prior to the presidency, to Sir Edward Newenham, in which he says:

I hope the United States of America will be able to keep disengaged from the labyrinth of European politics and wars. \* \* \* It should be the policy of the United States to administer to their wants without being engaged in their quarrels.

In 1791 he addressed a letter to Mr. Morris, in which he said:

I trust we shall never so far lose sight of our own interest and happiness as to become unnecessarily a party to these political disputes. Our local situation enables us to maintain that state with respect to them which otherwise could not, perhaps, be preserved by human wisdom.

The author from whom I quote, Senator LODGE, commenting upon this, says:

The world was told that a new power had come into being, which meant to hold aloof from Europe, and which took no interest in the balance of power or the fate of dynasties, but looked only to the welfare of its own people and to the conquest and mastery of a continent as its allotted tasks. The policy declared by the proclamation was purely American in its conception, and severed the colonial tradition at a stroke.

I digress to say I wish every boy and girl over the age of 15 years could be induced to read the brilliant story of Washington as it is found in those two volumes. If they were not better Americans, with higher ideals, after they had read it, nothing could make them so.

Again, Mr. President, in a letter to Patrick Henry, dated later, he says:

I can most religiously aver that I have no wish that is incompatible with the dignity, happiness, and true interest of the people of this country. My ardent desire is, and my aim has been, so far as dependent on the executive department, to comply strictly with all our engagements, foreign and domestic, but to keep the United States free from any political connections with every other country, to see it independent of all, and under the influence of none. In a word, I want an American character, that the powers of Europe may be convinced that we act for ourselves.

Pursuing this thought and this great principle throughout his administration until he had fairly established it as a part of

our foreign policy—the initiatory step of the same—he referred particularly to it in his Farewell Address. I shall detain the Senate by reading a single paragraph only. This was the conclusion of Washington after years of observation, after the most pointed experience, after eight years of administration of public affairs, and with as wide a vision and with as far-seeing a vision as ever accompanied a human mind upon this mundane sphere:

Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

Are there people in this day who believe that Europe now and in the future shall be free of selfishness, of rivalry, of humor, of ambition, of caprice? If not, are we not undertaking the task against which the Father of our Country warned when he bade farewell to public service? “Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground?” And yet in this proposed league of nations, in the very beginning, we are advised of an executive council which shall dominate and control its action, three members of which are Europeans, one member Asiatic, and one American.

If a controversy ever arises in which there is a conflict between the European system and the American system, or if a conflict ever arises in which their interests, their humor, their caprice, and their selfishness shall attempt to dominate the situation, shall we not have indeed quit our own to stand upon foreign ground?

Why should we interweave our destiny with the European destiny? Are we not interweaving our future and our destiny with European powers when we join a league of nations the constitution of which gives a majority vote in every single instance in which the league can ever be called into action to European powers?

Does the ex-President mean to say to an intelligent and thinking people that this league which thus grants this power to European governments is not interweaving our destiny with European destiny? Does he assume to say that that is not a departure from the plain terms of Washington’s Farewell Address?

I repeat what I said upon the floor of the Senate a few weeks ago. It may be that the people of America want to do this; it may be that they think their future happiness and tranquility necessitates their doing it, but I inveigh against the misleading statement that we do not propose to do it by this league of nations. Let us be candid with those upon whom must rest the future burdens and obligations and not undertake to advise them that that is not going to happen which must necessarily and inevitably happen.

Mr. President, Washington succeeded in establishing the policy that we should not interfere in European affairs. It would have served no good purpose and would not have been beneficial to the American people in the least had we simply remained aloof from European affairs but had permitted Europe to transfer her system to the American Continent. Therefore, the Monroe doctrine. It was designed to support the policy of Washington. He had warned against the danger of entering



Europe—the Monroe doctrine declared that Europe should not enter America. Permit me to say that one of these can not stand, in my judgment, without the support of the other. It is an inevitable result of Washington's teaching that the Monroe doctrine should exist. Indeed, such men as Mr. Coudert, the great lawyer, say that Washington's policy incorporated and included the Monroe doctrine; that Monroe's statement was simply an exemplification and application of the principle.

So, sir, in order that we might become a nation free from European broils and cease forever to have to do with European affairs, the Washington policy and the Monroe doctrine were announced and have ever since been maintained. The great question now is, are they policies which we should still maintain; are they in all essential particulars still indispensable to our well-being as a people and to our strength and permanency as a nation? The present war has drawn us to Europe, but only temporarily. The question shall we enter European affairs permanently and shall we invite Europe, with her systems of government, some more pernicious than in the days of Washington, to America. We had a temporary alliance with France when Washington became President, but he fought against the making of these alliances permanent. That is the question here.

What is the Monroe doctrine? I apologize to the Senate for going into that question. I do so more for others than my colleagues, but I will be brief. Before the exigencies arising out of the conditions connected with a defense of this league it would not have been necessary to discuss it. All understood it alike. The Monroe doctrine is simply the principle of self-defense applied to a people, and the principle of self-defense can not be the subject of arbitration or of enforcement by any one other than that one who is to claim and enforce the principle of self-defense.

The ex-President said the Monroe doctrine is covered and extended to the world. That was the condition before Monroe announced it? The world was one. Monroe determined to separate it and divide it, and that was the very object of it. It was a distinct announcement that the European system could not be transferred to America. The rest was simply detail. It was the division of two systems; it was the political partition of two continents. Monroe or Jefferson never would have contemplated for a moment sharing the enforcement of the Monroe doctrine with any nation of Europe. We would not even join with England in announcing it.

May I read here in connection with my remarks a statement by ex-Senator Root upon this particular feature? Before I do that, however, I desire to call attention to the language of Thomas Jefferson. It precedes the remark which I was about to make. This letter of Jefferson states as clearly as can be stated the prime object of the announcement of this doctrine:

The question presented by the letters you have sent me is the most momentous which has ever been offered to my contemplation since that of independence.

Why does the Sage of Monticello rank the Monroe doctrine next to the Declaration of Independence? Because he believed as that genius of constructive government, Hamilton, believed, and Washington believed, that we could not maintain our independence without the Monroe doctrine. He believed that it was

an indispensable pillar to our national independence, and second only to it in the catalogue of responsibilities and duties and obligations which rested upon us:

That made us a nation.

This sets our compass and points the course which we are to steer through the ocean of time opening on us. And never could we embark upon it under circumstances more auspicious. Our first and fundamental maxim should be never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe;

The Washington policy—

our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cis-Atlantic affairs.

Yet the ex-President says notwithstanding this we carry out this discrimination and distinction between European affairs and American affairs when we permit the two systems to be united, to be organized and administered by a common authority. He declares that although we do entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe, although we do suffer Europe to intermeddle with cis-Atlantic affairs, it is not in conflict with the Monroe doctrine.

I now call your attention to the statement of Senator Root upon the proposition advanced by the ex-President—of sharing with other nations responsibility in enforcing this doctrine. Mr. Root says:

Since the Monroe doctrine is a declaration based upon this Nation's right of self-protection, it can not be transmuted into a joint or common declaration by American States or any number of them.

We could not even share the responsibility and the execution of the Monroe doctrine with our Commonwealths here upon the Western Continent. It is personal; it is individual; it is the law of self-defense. It belongs to us, and we alone must determine when it shall be enforced or when it shall not apply. It is the same rule and principle which Australia invokes, and correctly invokes, with reference to the German islands near Australia. It is the same principle which Japan sought to have established in the Orient. It is the principle of self-defense and not of common defense, or defense by common authority invoked and sustained by the joint act of many nations.

Yet we are solemnly advised that although we should share it with all the Governments of Europe and Asia and all the tribes of the different races which may in the future be organized into some form of government, it is still the doctrine of self-defense which Jefferson and Monroe announced and which Mr. Root so clearly explained.

I read another paragraph from Mr. Root's speech, which leaves nothing further to be said both as to the meaning and the worth of this policy:

The familiar paragraphs of Washington's Farewell Address upon this subject were not rhetoric. They were intensely practical rules of conduct for the future guidance of the country:

"Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none, or a very remote, relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities. Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course."

It was the same instinct which led Jefferson, in the letter to Monroe already quoted, to say:

"Our first and fundamental maxim should be, never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe; our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cisatlantic affairs."



The concurrence of Washington and Hamilton and Jefferson in the declaration of this principle of action entitles it to great respect. \* \* \* Separation of influences as absolute and complete as possible was the remedy which the wisest of Americans agreed upon. It was one of the primary purposes of Monroe's declaration to insist upon this separation, and to accomplish it he drew the line at the water's edge. The problem of national protection in the distant future is one not to be solved by the first impressions of the casual observer, but only by profound study of the forces which, in the long life of nations, work out results. In this case the results of such a study by the best men of the formative period of the United States are supported by the instincts of the American democracy holding steadily in one direction for almost a century. The problem has not changed essentially. If the declaration of Monroe was right when the message was sent, it is right now.

We come now to the constitution of the proposed league of nations, which has been submitted to us. I shall not undertake to go into details; indeed, time would not permit to take up the many different phases which this constitution presents for consideration. I want only to call attention to some features of it bearing upon this particular subject matter—that is, the effect it has upon these two great policies.

The mere reading of the constitution of the league will convince any reasonable mind, any unprejudiced mind, that if put into effect the policy of Washington and the policy of Monroe must depart. The propositions are irreconcilable and can not exist together. In the first place, the league provides for an organization composed principally of five great nations, three of them European, one Asiatic, and one American. Every policy determined upon by the league and every movement made by it could be, and might be, controlled solely by European powers, whether the matter dealt with had reference to America or Europe. The league nowhere distinguishes or discriminates between European and American affairs. It functions in one continent the same as another. It compounds all three continents into a single unit, so far as the operations of the league are concerned. The league interferes in European affairs and in American affairs upon the same grounds and for the same reasons. If the territorial integrity of any member of the league is threatened or involved, whether that territory be in America or Europe, the league deals with the subject. If it becomes necessary for the league to act through economic pressure, or finally through military power, although the procedure may be voted by European powers alone, it may exert that pressure in America the same as in Europe. The very object and purpose of the league is to eliminate all differences between Europe and America and place all in a common liability to be governed and controlled by a common authority. If the United States, for instance, should disregard its covenants, as provided in the league, it would be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the league; and under our solemn obligation and agreement we would have authorized the European powers to wage war against us and upon the American Continent. And yet men deliberately and blandly state to the American people that this league constitution preserves the Monroe doctrine and the doctrine given us by Washington.

I read from article 10 as an illustration:

The high contracting parties shall undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial existence and existing political independence of all States members of the league.



Take for illustration one of our own associates and allies. England has possessions in three continents. As has been said, the sun never sets upon her possessions. They dot every sea and are found in every land. She to-day holds possession of one-fifth of the habitable globe, and we in article 10 guarantee the integrity of her possessions in the three continents of the earth.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator state what he is reading from?

Mr. BORAH. I am reading from article 10 of the constitution of the league.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is not the language of article 10 as printed in the Senate document at the request of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge]. There is nothing said about possessions there at all.

Mr. BORAH. Did I read possessions?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understood the Senator to say possessions.

Mr. BORAH. No; I think the Senator is mistaken. I will read it again:

The high contracting parties shall undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all States members of the league.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is correct.

Mr. BORAH. I presume that her territorial integrity necessarily involves her territorial possessions.

So, Mr. President, the first obligation which we assume is to protect the territorial integrity of the British Empire. That takes us into every part of the civilized world. That is the most radical departure from the Washington policy. I will come to the Monroe policy in a minute. Now, how are we to determine that?

In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the executive council shall advise upon the means by which the obligation shall be fulfilled.

Does that mean what it says, and is it to be executed in accordance with its plain terms? If the territorial integrity of any part of the British Empire shall be threatened not the Congress of the United States, not the people of the United States, not the Government of the United States determines what shall be done, but the executive council of which the American people have one member. We, if we mean what we say in this constitution, are pledging ourselves, our honor, our sacred lives, to the preservation of the territorial possessions the world over and not leaving it to the judgment and sense of the American people but to the diplomats of Europe.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator again uses the words "territorial possessions." That is what I am objecting to.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I will leave it to an intelligent audience to determine whether or not "territorial integrity" does not include "territorial possessions."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator will refer to article 7, the indications are there that the dominions of the British Empire are to be regarded as separate and independent self-governing countries.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am coming to that in a few moments. I admire the careful use of language by the Senator

from Nebraska when he says there are "indications." This constitution is prolific indeed of "indications."

That is the duty devolving upon us by virtue of the league, to enter European affairs. What would be the duty and the obligation of England, of France, of Italy, and of Japan to the other member should a disturbance arise upon the Western Continent? Suppose some threat of danger to the Republic should come from Mexico or from Mexico and its allies. We are not even consulted as to whether we shall call in help, but the duty devolves upon the council, in its initiative capacity, to at once assume jurisdiction of it and to proceed to the American continent to determine what its duties shall be with reference to American affairs. This league operates upon the Western Continent with the same jurisdiction and power and the same utter disregard of which continent it is upon as it does in the European Continent. Does anybody deny that proposition?

Let us take a homely illustration; perhaps it may better illustrate the argument. A great many years ago a man by the name of Europe opened a farm. He begins the tillage of his great farm, but turmoil, strife, and dissension arise among his tenants. Finally a dissatisfied European by the name, we will call him, America, determines to leave these turmoils on the European farm to go into the forest, open a clearing, and establish a new farm. He says, "I shall go where I can worship God according to the dictates of my own conscience. I shall go where I can set up a new system of farming." He goes into the wilderness and sacrifices and finally establishes a farm of his own. After he has established it he declares, after reflection, "I am afraid those Europeans will come here and cause me the same disturbance and trouble and establish the same kind of a system which we had in Europe; so I will establish a partition fence." He does establish a partition fence. When he has finished the fence he says, "I will neither go to your farm nor shall you come to mine; I have had some experience with you, and I do not want to try it again." So he builds an insurmountable wall or fence between his neighbor Europe and himself. It stands for a hundred years. People sit about and discuss it, and pass many eulogies, declaring over and over again that it was one of the wisest things that a farmer ever did. But suddenly a new inspiration dawns, and it is thought that it would be a good idea to tear down the wall or fence and to commingle and intermingle the systems; to join one farm to another and have one superintendent. It is said to the farmer America, "Let us tear down this fence." He replies in surprise and consternation, "I built it for a purpose." "Well," it is contended by the idealist, "we think it is better to tear it down." At this time there rises up a man by the name of William Howard. He says to farmer America, "Let us tear down that wall fence of yours. It must be done right away. Anyone who opposes can not be trusted overnight." The farmer says, "I do not think it would be well." "But," William Howard replies, "it is just the same after it is torn down as it is when it is standing up. We are going to put a fence around both farms, and that will be the same as a fence between the farms." William Howard further says, "Let us go into partnership with your neighbor Europe." America says, "I do not want any partnership. I came here to get away from that very thing."



William Howard urges, with a spirit of unselfishness and good naturedly, "It is just the same without a partnership as it is with it. Let us transmute or combine these two systems and make them one." "But," farmer America says, "I came to this country to get away from that system. I do not want one system; I want two systems. I do not like their system of farming." William Howard replies, "One system is just the same as two systems." He declares, furthermore, "I know something about this; I ran this farm for four years myself [laughter]; I know how to run it; and I declare to you that the best thing for you to do is to tear down your wall fence, to unite your two systems, and make one farm out of it and one common overseer." He further, by way of a profound argument, casually remarks, "I had such remarkable success while I was running this farm and received such universal commendation upon my work after it was over, having received the approval of 2 tenants out of 48, that I am sure that I can run both farms, at least, I am anxious to try." [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The galleries must preserve order.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, some of us declare that this proposition tears down the farmer's fence. We say furthermore that we do not want two farms made into one. If you want to do so, all right, go ahead; but let us make no mistake about what we are doing. Let us not try to fool ourselves or anyone else.

What do other countries think about it, Mr. President? I should like to call in outside witnesses, notwithstanding the very profound respect that I have for the ex-President. The English press, we are informed in so far as it has commented upon this subject at all, has regarded it as an abrogation of the Monroe doctrine. Mr. Lloyd-George said in the very beginning of these conferences that Great Britain could concede much to the United States if, as the result, they were to draw the United States out of her isolation and away from her traditional foreign policies. Japan has practically announced semiofficially that it is the abolishment of the Monroe doctrine. The Brazilian Minister at The Hague has announced that it is the end of the Monroe doctrine. Why leave it in doubt? Do you Senators, or those who are in favor of the league of nations, want to destroy the Monroe doctrine? If you do not, why leave it in doubt? Why leave it to the construction of European diplomats sitting behind closed doors? By the insertion of three lines in this constitution you can place it beyond peradventure, beyond contention or cavil. The question which I submit now is, if you are unwilling to do this, is it not proof conclusive that you intend to destroy the policy and wipe out this long-standing doctrine?

Let us go to another feature of this league. I am not here to-day to criticize in any way, either directly or by inference, the great English nation or the great English people. They are among, not excepting our own, the most powerful and admirable people upon the globe. Every man must pay his profound respect to their genius and to their capacity for Government and for mastery of great problems. But when we come to deal with England, we must deal with her intelligently and with a due regard for our own interests and our own rights, for one of the distinguishing characteristics of that proud nation is that



England always looks after England's interests. I admire her for doing so.

Her national spirit never fails her. The talents and genius of her statesmen never betray her. She has signed many treaties which have been worthless in the hour of peril. She has entered into many leagues and combinations which have dissolved, but her proud national spirit never forsakes her. Ultimately she relies upon this instead of treaties and leagues. She has passed through many a crisis, she has seen dark hours; but in every crisis, however severe, and in the darkest hour every Englishman is expected to do his duty and does it. I admire her for her national spirit, for her vigilance in guarding the interests of the Empire.

Mr. President, this constitution of the league of nations is the greatest triumph for English diplomacy in three centuries of English diplomatic life. This constitution, in the first place, is lifted almost bodily, as you will see if you will compare the two, from the constitution proposed in January by Gen. Smuts. There is not an organic, a vital principle incorporated in this constitution that is not found in Gen. Smuts's constitution. As is known to all, Gen. Smuts, a South African, is one of the most remarkable men under the English rule to-day. That you may not think I am stating it strongly, let me read a word from the London Times on the second day after this constitution was adapted:

The project, if not the same as that outlined by Gen. Smuts, is like it as its brother. \* \* \* It is a cause for legitimate pride to recognize in the covenant so much of the work of Englishmen. \* \* \* It is again a source of legitimate pride to Englishmen that article 19 in the covenant might almost be taken as an exposition of the principles animating the relations of Great Britain with India and the dominions.

Listen to this language—

That the dominions are in this document recognized as nations before the world is also a fact of profound significance in the history of these relations.

The gentleman who wrote that editorial had not acquired the capacity of using language to conceal his thoughts; he labored under the disadvantage of having to use language to convey his thoughts. The fact that the dominions of Great Britain and her colonies are recognized as nations is a matter of "profound significance." Yes; when they finally settle down to business England will have one vote, Canada one vote, New Zealand one vote, Australia one vote, and South Africa one vote, whilst the American Nation, brought into being by our fathers at so much cost of blood and treasure and preserved through the century by the vigilance and sacrifice of our forbears, this Nation with all her wealth and resources will have one vote. In both the executive council and the delegate body the same proportion obtains, and those two bodies direct, dominate, and mark out the policy of this entire program, whatever it is to be, under the league. A matter of "profound significance!"

I ask you who are in favor of this league, are you willing to give to any nation five votes against our one? Do you presume that the questions of interest, of ambition, of selfishness, of caprice, of humor will not arise in the future? Have they not already, in a proper way, but none the less in an

unmistakable way, made their appearance since the armistice was signed? Are we not already advised that we must use the same intelligence, the same foresight, the same prevision, and the same patriotism that our fathers used against the inherent, the inevitable selfishness of all nations? Yet we are seriously proposing that we shall join a league whose constitutional powers shall determine—what? Shall determine policies, politic and economic, upon the two continents and shall give to our greatest commercial rival five votes to our one.

Mr. President, I have called attention to some of the obligations which we assume. Let me repeat a single statement. You have now observed the number of votes in the executive council, but that is not all. There are Italy and Japan associated with England, and more nearly like her in their systems and in their policies than they are like the United States. There are already treaties between those nations and England, which Mr. Balfour frankly says are not to be abrogated; in other words, we are in the very beginning put up not only against this extraordinary vote by one nation but we have the disadvantage of contending against a system, which system covers other nations as well as that of Great Britain.

We all want the friendship and the respect of and future amicable relations between Great Britain and this country. That also was Washington's wish; that was Jefferson's wish; that was also Lincoln's wish; but never for a moment did they surrender any power or any authority or compromise their capacity in any way to take care of the situation in case there should not be an agreement between the two powers.

What has England given up in this league of nations? What has she surrendered? Will some one advise me? Did she surrender the freedom of the seas? That was pushed aside at the first meetings of the conference as not subject to its jurisdiction. Has she surrendered her claim for the largest navy? What has she surrendered?

On the other hand, we have surrendered the traditional foreign policy of this country, which has been established for 100 years; and we have gone behind these powers and placed at their disposal our finances, our man power, and our full capacity to guarantee the integrity of their possessions all over the globe. Is it an even balance, is it an equitable, is it an honest arrangement between these great powers and the United States?

I come now to another feature, which to me is even more interesting, more menacing, than those over which we have passed. Conceal it as you may, disguise it as some will attempt to do, this is the first step in internationalism and the first distinct effort to sterilize nationalism. This is a recognized fact, tacitly admitted by all who support it and expressly admitted by many, that the national State has broken down and that we must now depend upon the international State and international power in order to preserve our interests and our civilization. The national State can no longer serve the cause of civilization, and therefore we must resort to the international State. That is disclosed in every line and paragraph of this instrument. It begins with the preamble and ends with the last article—a recognition that internationalism must take the place of nationalism.

May I call attention to a statement from perhaps the most famous internationalist now living. I read from a book entitled "The Bolsheviks and World Peace," by Trotzky. He says:

The present war is at bottom a revolt of the forces of production against the political form of nation and State. It means the collapse of the national State as an independent economic unit.

In another paragraph:

The war proclaims the downfall of the national state. \* \* \* We Russian Socialists stand firmly on the ground of internationalism. \* \* \* The German social democracy was to us not only a party of the international—it was *the* party par excellence.

Again, he declares:

The present war signalizes the collapse of the national states.

He proceeds to argue that the only thing which can take the place of the national state is internationalism, to internationalize our governments, internationalize our power, internationalize production, internationalize our economic capacity, and become an international state the world over. That is at the bottom of this entire procedure, whether consciously or unconsciously, upon the part of those who are advocating it. It will be the fruit of this effort if it succeeds—the dead sea fruit for the common people everywhere. It is a distinct announcement that the intense nationalism of Washington, the intense nationalism of Lincoln, can no longer serve the cause of the American people, and that we must internationalize and place the sovereign powers of this Government to make war and control our economic forces in an international tribunal.

A few days ago one of the boldest and most brilliant internationalists of this country—a man, no doubt, who believes in it as firmly as I believe in nationalism—wrote this paragraph:

The death of Col. Roosevelt was a shock, I think, to everybody who loves life. No man ever lived who had more fun in 61 years; and yet his death, with that last frantic reiteration of Americanism and nothing but Americanism, fresh from his pen, was like a symbol of the progress of life. The boyish magnetism is all gone out of those words. They die in the dawn of revolutionary internationalism.

I sometimes wonder, Can it be true? Are we, indeed, yielding our Americanism before the onrushing tide of revolutionary internationalism? Did the death of this undaunted advocate of American nationalism mark an epoch in the fearful, damnable, downward trend?

Yes, Mr. President, this many-sided man touched life at every point, and sometimes seemed inconsistent; but there was one supreme passion which gave simplicity and singleness of purpose to all he said or did—his abounding Americanism. In this era of national infidelity let us be deeply grateful for this. Though he had erred a thousand times, and grievously erred, we would still pay sincere tribute to his memory for holding aloft at all times, and especially in the world's greatest turmoil, the banner of the true faith. Huntsman, plainsman, author, political leader, governor, Vice President, President, and ex-President, this was always the directing and dominating theme. Even in his full, rich life, replete with noble deeds and brilliant achievements, it runs like a golden thread through all of the bewildering activities of his wide-ranging genius. It gave consistency to every change of view and justified what sometimes seemed his merciless intolerance. When the final



estimate is placed upon his career, and all his services to his fellows are weighed and judged, his embodiment of the national spirit, his vigilant defense of our national integrity, his exemplification of our national ideals will distinguish him, as says in effect this internationalist, from all the men of his day and generation.

Mr. President, I am not a pessimist. I find neither solace nor guidance in the doleful doctrine. But who will gainsay that we have reached a supreme hour in the history of the Republic he loved? There is not a Government in existence to-day but feels the strain of those inscrutable forces which are working their willful way through all the established institutions of men. Church and creed, ancient governments and new, despotic and liberal, order and law, at this time stand under challenge. Hunger and disease, business anxiety, and industrial unrest threaten to demobilize the moral forces of organized society. In all of this turmoil and strife, in all this chaos of despair and hope, there is much that is good if it can be brought under direction and subordinated to the sway of reason. At the bottom of it all there is the infinite longing of oppressed humanity seeking in madness to be rid of oppression and to escape from these centuries of injustice. How shall we help to bring order out of chaos? Shall we do so by becoming less or more American? Shall we entangle and embarrass the efforts of a powerful and independent people, or shall we leave them in every emergency and in every crisis to do in that particular hour and in that supreme moment what the conscience and wisdom of an untrammelled and liberty-loving people shall decide is wise and just? Or shall we yoke our deliberations to forces we can not control and leave our people to the mercy of powers which may be wholly at variance with our conception of duty? I may be willing to help my neighbor, though he be improvident or unfortunate, but I do not necessarily want him for a business partner. I may be willing to give liberally of my means, of my council and advice, even of my strength or blood, to protect his family from attack or injustice, but I do not want him placed in a position where he may decide for me when and how I shall act or to what extent I shall make sacrifice. I do not want this Republic, its intelligence, and its patriotism, its free people and its institutions to go into partnership with and to give control of the partnership to those, many of whom have no conception of our civilization and no true insight into our destiny. What we want is what Roosevelt taught and urged—a free, untrammelled Nation, imbued anew and inspired again with the national spirit. Not isolation but freedom to do as our own people think wise and just; not isolation but simply the unembarrassed and unentangled freedom of a great Nation to determine for itself and in its own way where duty lies and where wisdom calls. There is not a supreme council possible of creation or conceivable equal in wisdom, in conscience, and humanitarianism to the wisdom and conscience and humanitarianism of the hundred million free and independent liberty-loving souls to whom the living God has intrusted the keeping of this Nation. The moment this Republic comes to any other conclusion it has forfeited its right to live as an independent and self-respecting Republic.

It was not, one likes to believe, a mere incident, but a significant though strangely arranged fact that the last message to the American people from the illustrious dead who, the internationalists tell us, was the last of the great Americans, should have been upon this particular subject. I believe it was the night of his death that this message which I shall now read to you was read at a public meeting to which he had been invited but was unable to attend:

Any man who says he is an American but something else also isn't an American at all. We have room for but one flag, the American flag. \* \* \* We have room for but one language, and that is the English language; for we intend to see that the crucible turns our people out as Americans, of American nationality, and not as dwellers in a polyglot boarding house; and we have room for but one soul loyalty to the American people.

Let us inscribe this upon our banner and hang it upon the outer wall. In all the vicissitudes of our national life, in all the duties which may come to us as a people, in all the future, filled, as it will be, with profound and perplexing problems, let us cling uncompromisingly to this holy creed. In these times, when ancient faiths are disappearing and governments are crumbling, when institutions are yielding to the tread of the mad hosts of disorder, let us take our stand on the side of orderly liberty, on the side of constitutional government. Let us range ourselves along with Washington and Jefferson and Jackson and Lincoln and Roosevelt. Let us be true to ourselves; and, whatever the obligations of the future, we can not then be false to others.

106587—19309

